

TED KACZYNSKI
to
BEAU FRIEDLANDER

October 3, 1999

87

Dear Beau,

You have fucked things up good.

Most importantly, you kept telling me in effect that no significant changes would have to be made in Truth versus Lies due to libel problems. See your letters to me, 10/21/98, p. 1, ¶ 2; 10/22/98, p. 1, ¶ 1, 2; 10/29/98, p. 1, ¶ 3; 11/4/98, p. 1, ¶ 2; 4/7/99, p. 1, ¶ 3. Your statements about copyright problems were more cautious, but they still gave the impression that deletions of copyrighted material would be modest. See your letters to me, 9/4/98, p. 1, ¶ 3; 9/21/98, p. 1, ¶ 2; 10/20/98, p. 2, ¶ 3, 4; 11/23/98, p. 3, ¶ 2-4, p. 5, ¶ 1; 12/14/98, p. 2, ¶ 4; 12/29/98, p. 1, ¶ 5; 3/20/99, p. 2, ¶ 2; 4/7/99, p. 3, ¶ 1. (Also see letter from Miller to Friedlander, 4/1/99, p. 3, ¶ 4, of which you sent me a copy.) In your letter to me of 7/19/99, p. 1, ¶ 2, you wrote, "Unfortunately this material ... will have to be paraphrased." From the context it appeared that the foregoing statement referred only to the quoted material in Chapter XV, and I wrote you on 7/26/99, page 4, "You say that 'this material' will have to be paraphrased. I assume that by 'this material' you mean my quotations from my brother's letters in Chapter XV." You did not correct this assumption in your answering letter (8/2/99), which implied your acceptance of the assumption. More important than any of the foregoing, you wrote me on 8/7/99, p. 3, ¶ 4: "There

are no more libel or defamation issues." And on 8/31/99, p.2, #1, you wrote me, "I thought you might like to know that there are no remaining legal issues with regard to the publication of Truth versus Lies."

But, in spite of these assurances, the proofs that you sent me in late September contained several very important deletions of quoted material, as well as changes made because of libel issues, that had never been mentioned to me previously. When I received these proofs I became very angry at you, because I could think of only three plausible explanations: Either you were incompetent (which I do not believe is the case), or your lawyer was incompetent (and you've assured me he is extremely competent), or else you had been bullshitting me about the extent of the legal changes that would have to be made: Because you were afraid that I would not accept the changes, you put off informing me of them until the book was already set in type, thinking that I would agree to the changes when I was faced with what was almost a fait accompli.

However, after I had cooled down somewhat (which took me a long time), I reflected that there might be some explanation other than incompetence or deception on your part — even though I was unable to

think of one.

So I await your explanation. You had better come up with a good one, because the facts as stated above constitute pretty strong prima facie ~~are~~ evidence of either incompetence on your part or your lawyers', or else deception on your part. Since my arrest I've had more than I can take of bullshit, deviousness, and broken promises, and I won't work with anyone who isn't strictly honest with me.

Ted

P.S. In my letter #83 (9/18/99), p-6, I expressed some wonderment at the fact that your lawyers hadn't done any trimming of the quotations I used prior to Chapter XV. It now appears that you simply weren't telling me about the deletions that your lawyers had recommended in that part of the book. And that in fact they had cut that material far more heavily than I would have expected.

—T.

P.P.S. In any case, whatever your explanation may be, the changes you want to make in the book are unacceptable.

—T.